DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 579 EA 021 054

AUTHOR Hallinger, Philip; Wimpelberg, Robert
TITLE New Settings and Changing Paradigms for Principal Preparation.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Effectiveness; Administrator Role; *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Leadership; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Training; *Principals; Professional Development

ABSTRACT

This paper adapts the framework developed by J. Murphy and P. Hallinger (1987) in a conceptual analysis of current approaches to educational leadership development. Murphy and Hallinger identified differentiating patterns of program operation in the areas of program content, program process, program focus, and what this referred to as "supporting tissue." The first section presents the conceptual framework. Next, examples from specific principal development programs are used to illustrate the range of variation among emerging approaches within the context of the conceptual framework. In the final section, the implications of the analysis for the future of principal training and development are discussed. (42 references) (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED308579

New Settings and Changing Paradigms for Principal Preparation

Philip Hallinger
Vanderbilt University
and
Robert Wimpelberg
University of New Orleans

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, March 1989.

EA 021 054

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Philip J. Hallinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Recent analyses of professional development services for school administrators have identified a variety of features and characteristics that differentiate these programs from traditional administrative training programs (see Levine, 1986; Murphy & Hallinger, 1986, 1987). Cooper and Boyd (1987) note the use of new recruitment practices, a focus on skills-based training, and development experiences that are jointly attended with corporate managers as departures from what they refer to as "the one best model" of administrative training. Drawing on the work of Miles and Passow (1957), Wimpelberg (in press) analyzes "the new administrative inservice" for school administrators. He finds differences in the nature of participants, time and physical arrangements for training, roles within the training organization, content of the development program, training procedures, and evaluation of training experiences. Murphy and Hallinger (1987) contrast emerging developments in this field with traditional efforts of the past 30 years. They identify differentiating patterns of program operation in the areas of program content, program process, program focus, and what they refer to as "supporting tissue" (Murphy & Hallinger, 1987).

The intention of the above analysts has been to compare past and present practice in educational leadership development. Given this broad purpose, they tend to present both past and present practice as homogenous categories. Differences among current approaches are typically deemphasized in the desire to highlight and understand broader changes in the trends. While these efforts have laid useful groundwork, attempts to project future needs, patterns, and outcomes for the development of principals requires a richer understanding of both the range and implications of current approaches to developing school leadership.

This paper adapts the framework developed by Murphy and Hallinger (1987) and applies it in a conceptual analysis of current approaches to educational leadership development. In the following section, the analytical framework is presented. Next, we draw examples from our knowledge of specific principal development programs to illustrate the range of variation among emerging approaches within the context of the conceptual framework. In the final section, we discuss the implications of the analysis for the future of principal training and development.

Conceptual Framework

Two analytical categories are offered in preparation for the case illustrations and analysis: program content and organizational processes. In this section we define these analytical categories. In addition, we briefly summarize the reported differences between traditional and emerging programs of principal development.

Program Content

Content refers to the actual substance of the development program. Activities may be driven by practice, research, social science theory, or a combination of the three. On this dimension, Cooper and Boyd (1987) have noted a movement away from social science theory and towards research-based literature, drawing particularly on studies of school and teacher effects. Crowson and McPherson (1987) describe a clear trend towards "the exploration of peer-assisted, problem solving, on the job learning, [and] reflective thinking... emerging approaches to administrative training" (p.46). This pattern reflects an increased emphasis on problems of practice and a conscious validation of the administrator's experience. Barth (1986a) and his colleagues (Levine, Barth, & Haskins, 1987) term these understandings inductively derived from the experience of practitioners as "craft knowledge". Craft knowledge represents an important knowledge base among the emerging programs of principal development.

The structural conditions under which a professional development program emerges shape the program offered to participants. Programs are sponsored by agencies with widely varying missions, objectives, and agendas, maintain different relationships with administrators. Structural conditions represent an important source of implicit assumptions that influence other features of the program. For example, the structural conditions often determine the means by which program goals and objectives are defined. These, in turn, become key determinants of the philosophy and curriculum content of training programs. Conceptually, one can view this on a continuum ranging from external, agency determined goals and objectives on one end to individually determined, principal-centered goals and objectives on the other.

Finally, the purposes of development programs may vary. Some programs are primarily concerned with the dissemination of technical knowledge, while others are primarily designed to encourage the acquisition of a new identity, commitment to an ideology, or establishment of a social bond through peer solidarity (Murphy & Hallinger, 1987, pp. 262-263). Traditional programs emphasized the acquisition of scientific knowledge and theoretical models. Emerging programs exhibit considerable variation on this dimension. Professional socialization represents an explicit goal for certain programs, while skill development guides others (Barth, 1986a; Hallinger, Greenblatt, & Edwards, in press; Thoms, 1987). These purposes are reflected in program design and content.

Organizational Processes and Professional Development

Theoretical structure refers to the grounding of the knowledge base for development activities in either inductive or deductive approaches to knowledge generation. Crowson and McPherson (1987) suggest that the "theory movement":

> represented a determined effort to bring the social science disciplines... to bear upon administrator preparation in education... [T]he movement sought to produce a foundation of scientifically supported (hypothetico-deductive) knowledge in educational administration in place of the hortatory, seat of the pants literature already in place (p.48).

In contrast, inductive approaches to knowledge generation and acquisition emphasize experiential learning and the generation of personally useful frameworks for understanding problems of practice (see Barth, 1986a; Barnett, 1987; LaPlant, 1987). The movement towards inductively generated knowledge and personal frameworks for understanding problems of practice has implications for the design of professional development programs. First, there is an increased emphasis on the learner, rather than the teacher as a source of "expert knowledge". Thus the role of the teacher becomes one of facilitating knowledge sharing, rather than dispensing scientifically validated, generalizable knowledge. This further suggests the appropriateness of informal learning in non-traditional settings. Faculty may include educational practitioners, university teachers, or managers from other sectors. In general, emerging programs appear to be drawing more from practitioners than from the traditonal source of preparation and development, university faculty.

Another process related dimension is the mode of administrator participation, e.g., voluntary, self-directed with incentives and sanctions, or mandated. Grass roots programs often emphasize voluntary participation in programs in the belief that effective learning among adults is directly related to the motivation to attend programs of personal and professional development (see Hallinger & Greenblatt, 1988; Levine et al., 1987; Peterson, 1987; Thoms, 1987). Since 1983, many states (e.g., Texas, North Carolina, Maine, Tennessee) have imposed requirements that practicing administrators complete a certain number of inservice courses in administration over a period of years. In some cases, the courses to be completed are left to the discretion of the individual. Thus, incentives and sanctions exist, but there is still some individual choice. In other cases, states and some school districts have mandated administator participation in selected professional development programs as a means of

ensuring administor competence.

Programmatic Variations in the Professional Development of Principals

Labeling methods of administrative development "traditional" or "emergent", as recent analyses have done, heightens a sense of "either - or" that hides considerable internal variation in the new administrative preparation. Contrasts between "old and new paradigms" or between "traditional practice" and the new "social movement" (Wimpelberg, in press) highlight differences between practices of the 1960s and 1980s, but cloud distinctions within current fashions of administrative development that are likely to emerge as models and choices relevant to the twenty-first century. Using the rubrics of program content and organizational processes, we have constructed a set of parallel continua that array some of the features of newer programs for administrative development in such a manner as to highlight their internal differences.

The contrast between emergent state directed and homegrown professional development efforts is, however, imperfect. As noted elsewhere, there are many similarities as well as differences among them. Additionally, there are exceptions to any trends we might identify. Still, the reader should note the degree to which variations among emerging programs of principal development appear related to the locus of the program and the motivation behind its formation. To our knowledge, no data exist at this time that shed light on the relative effectiveness of programs founded on either approach. Empirical contrasts of these models represent an important domain for future research in this field.

Program Content: From Essentialism to Existentialism

In the past, options for administrative inservice were limited, expectations for involvement were often low, and participation by principals in ongoing programs of professional growth was, at best, sporadic (Wimpelberg, in press). The dramatic growth in number and types of organizations now providing professional development for school administrators is testimony to a previously unfulfilled need for administrative development. This need is now perceived as an important one both by governmental and educational service agencies and by administrators themselves (Hallinger & Greenblatt, 1988, in press; Levine et al., 1987; Murphy & Hallinger, 1986). The growth of "grass roots" principals' centers and state directed leadership academies must be understood as a two pronged movement in the field of principal training and development: centralized academies that have responded to pressures for reform and local principals' centers that have responded to the needs and aspirations of principals. Both types of development centers capitalize on the desire of administrators for increased opportunities for growth on-the-job and for the reduction of isolation. There are, however, also substantial differences in philosophy between them.

In our judgment, differing conceptions of professional development are often, though not always, associated with the locus of development efforts. That is, state directed leadership academies and "grass roots" principals' centers often differ in their fundamental purposes and philosophies. The chartered purpose of state centered efforts, with their genesis in reform legislation, is frequently to change the behaviors and job practices of school administrators. From this perspective, professional training for principals is viewed as a piece of a larger instrumental process of school reform (Cuban 1984). In some cases, this results in a benign but pervasive norm in which principals are implicitly viewed as "broken parts" in the system. Principals are required or encouraged to attend programs so that they can be "retooled" or "repaired" through professional development.

In contrast, "grass roots" principals' centers tend to form in direct response to the needs of local principals. The motivation behind the formation of such centers is often related to internal needs for renewal, desires for reduced isolation, and the need for additional skills and assistance to address specific school related problems (Hallinger & Greenblatt, 1988, in press). Consequently, they tend to

take a more growth-oriented approach to professional training.

The more varied set of motiations for participation may also result in a broader sense of the center's mission. As we note later in the paper, the programmatic focus of these programs is comprised of activities designed, implicitly or explicitly, towards professional socialization. The inferred purposes behind such activities include renewing the commitment of administrators, enhancing their sense of what it means to be a principal, and developing a sense of shared educational purpose.

These purposes are also reflected in the governance structures and organization roles of grass roots principals' centers. Participating administrators often play multiple roles in these centers, other than that of client. They may serve on a governing board, on program committees, and as presenters. The symbolic and pragmatic functions of these types of involvement are not to be minimized. Symbolically, such participation engenders a sense of professionalism and pride in the profession, as well as recognition for contributions made beyond the individual school. Pragmatically, these modes of participation provide opportunities for renewal to administrators who have few opportunites to work colsely with peers and who have relatively few career options. Additionally, ongoing professional involvement in a local center ensures that the center's programs, whatever they may be, continue to meet the needs of the clients. This is a significant function in a field traditionally inhabited by service providers operating in highly regulated markets in which the needs perceived by the clients have traditionally been discounted or ignored.

Determinants of program goals. A major source of variation among the newer professional development programs results from the increased diversity in sponsoring agencies and the consequent effects on goals and program curriculum. As noted earlier, some centers draw their program goals, objectives and curriculum from highly centralized sources, while others rely upon local or even individual initiative for defining program needs, goals and programmatic content. Figure 1 depict the range of observed variation on this dimension.

Figure 1
Organizational Setting and Determinants of
Goals for Professional Development

State Legislated Goals & Curriculum	Locally Determined, Agency -related Goals	Group-defined Goals	Individually-defined Goals

On the left side of this continuum fall development programs in which goals are externally defined for school administrators. During this era of school reform, state legislators and state education department professionals have been particularly active in defining educational priorities and goals. Program goals are often derived from state reform legislation drawn up by legislative staff with input from state education officials. These determine the curricula which are often disseminated statewide

through central or regional leadership academies (e.g., West Virginia, California, Mississippi, Illinois). The rationale for this approach is twofold. First, there is the pragmatic desire among legislators to establish accountability and engineer change through improved leadership. This is combined with a widespread, though somewhat simplistic, faith in the existence of a clearly defined, scientifically validated knowledge base for school leadership. We discuss the basis and effects of this second issue later in the section of the paper.

On the middle of this continuum fall a wide variety of programs. In some states (e.g., New York), funding has been provided for centers using a decentralized model. Regional centers are expected to delineate locally relevant needs, goals, and program objectives in return for state funding. There are, however, no formal requirements for regional centers to address the same set of goals or to implement a standard curriculum. Many programs sponsored by intermediate agencies, universities, professional associations and larger school districts also lie on this portion of the continuum. Training needs are either locally determined or a set program is offered to those who are interested based upon market forces (e.g., AASA/NASE, ASCD, NASSP).

On the far right side of this continuum are programs that derive their goals and program objectives directly from the needs of individual participants. This may occur in a number of ways. A local center may conduct needs assessments among its members and develop its program accordingly. A small principals' group may meet with an evolving agenda (Endo, 1987; Thoms, 1987). Or a specific program may be based upon meeting the developing needs and interests of individuals (e.g., a visiting practitioners' program, peer-assisted leadership). In these cases, participation is voluntary and almost always responsive to a problem, need, or issue of particular importance to the individual principal(s). Programs only survive and thrive to the degree that they meet these needs.

Curricular content. Observers have also noted that the new administrative development has moved away from the deductively driven, theory-based content of the social and behavioral sciences (Barth, 1986a; Cooper & Boyd, 1987; Crowson & McPherson, 1987; Hallinger & Murphy, 1987; Levine et al., 1987; Peterson, 1987). Instead, content in the programs of leadership academies and principals' centers is increasingly grounded in practice, drawing its knowledge base from professional experience. On this score we can uncover a range of options in administrative programs that run the gamut from commonly recognized research-derived content (if not theory-based) to individualistic "craft knowledge" (see Figure 2). As noted earlier, there is often, though there need not be, a relationship between the determinant of development goals and the nature of the program content.

Figure 2
Variation in Program Content
Among Emerging Professional Development Programs

Research based effectiveness correlates	Management and school-oriented skill packages	Individualized reflective insight

"Effectiveness" is the byword of much of the new training content of emerging programs. Research on the effectiveness of principals, teachers, and schools structures a certain portion of the learning in many centers. Documented examples include the Harvard Principals' Center's summer program (Levine, personal communication), the Vanderbilt Principals' Institute (Peterson, 1987), the Principals' Professional Development Academy, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, the North Carolina Principals' Leadership Academy, (Grier, 1987), the South Carolina Leadership Academy (Thompson, 1987) and the Maryland Professional Development Academy (Sanders, 1987). The focus on effectiveness is apparent in the curricula used throughout these leadership centers. Behaviors ascribed to effective principals and approaches to developing positive school climates are taught in awareness seminars and, in some cases, translated into change formulations for administrators to transport from the program back to the school.

Second only to effectiveness is the program content in instructional leadership and teacher evaluation. The state of Texas requires its principals to get annual practice in these areas of school management (MacDonald, n.d.). Connecticut and South Carolina have also revamped their requirements and training in the area of teacher evaluation. Illinois recently passed legislation mandating principals to spend a majority of time on instructional leadership tasks. Corresponding training designed to equip principals with the necessary skills is provided by the State through a network of regional service centers. A generally similar approach to the dissemination of "state legitimated knowledge" has been taken in California, South Carolina, Maryland, Mississippi, West Virginia and other states.

The extent to which the effectiveness research and instructional evaluation procedures have been incorporated into administrative development indicates the kind of "essentialist" role they play in our current thinking about good school management. They come the closest, as elements of training content, to a kind of neo-orthodoxy that may displace classical motivation and leadership theory in the traditional paradigm. At a minimum, the behavioral focus of current efforts has already displaced the theory movement in administrative training in education (Cooper & Boyd, 1987; Crowson & MacPherson, 1987; Murphy & Hallinger, 1987).

Somewhere along the continuum between the effectiveness - instruction content and idiosyncratic, personalized reflection on experience lie "managerial skill and knowledge" sessions. This content includes up-to-date computer applications, the latest findings in school law, and contractual obligations imposed by collective bargaining (Daresh, 1986). Specific school-bound issues such as parental involvement, student discipline, board and district policy implementation are common in many programs. Applied content related to such a set of "technologies" and practices is useful and easily packaged for the busy middle manager.

At a farthest point on the continuum from the research-based, effectiveness program is the content of discovery. This can take a variety of forms: facilitated /I/D/E/A/ groups (LaPlant, 1987), "shadowing" in the Peer-Assisted Leadership (Barnett, 1987), shared journal writing (Schainker & Roberts, 1987), case writing (Silver, 1987), or emergent problem solving around issues of practice in collegial groups (Endo, 1987; Hallinger, Greenblatt & Edwards, in press; Levine et al., 1987; Thoms, 1987). Content in this domain takes its legitimacy from personal, existential revelation rather than from empirically validated, state legitimized, and broadly generalizable conclusions drawn from research on schools and classrooms.

Organizational Processes and Leadership Development

We noted earlier that participation by principals in professional growth activities can be motivated by any of several sources. These include individual interest and motivation; district

expectations, policies or norms; state certification requirements; and, state mandated training. Figure 3 portrays these sources as a continuum leading again from externally imposed participation to internally motivated participation (for a discussion of factors motivating participation, see Hallinger & Greenblatt, in press).

Figure 3
Motivators of Principal Participation
in Leadership Development Programs

State/District Mandated Participation	To Meet State Certification Requirements	To Meet Professional Norms	To Meet Internal Needs for Growth or Solve a Problem

State mandated participation in specifically designed programs now occurrs in a number of states. Hundreds of administrators are tracked through state designed and delivered professional development programs each year. Larger school district have also increased the number of required inservice days for both site and central office administrators. Anecdotal reports and opinion surveys of participants suggest that a large portion of these administrators are pleased to attend and feel the experience is worthwhile. As noted above, however, little systematic evaluation has been conducted to determine the results of such programs on the implementation of training content, skill development, or school related outcomes.

A number of states have increased their licensing and certification requirements, but have left the means of meeting the requirements to the individual. That is, certification requirements may be met through university sponsored coursework, state leadership academies, or conferences run by professional associations.

One of the interesting changes noticed by observers of the principals' center movement has been the evolution of professional norms regarding principal development. In the past, professional development for many principals meant going to a convention and was largely left to the discretion of the individual. Over the past ten years, however, we have witnessed the emergence of professional norms which communicate the need for ongoing growth on the job for principals and other school supervisors (Hallinger & Greenblatt, 1988, in press). Whereas 10 years ago it was unheard of for an administrator to spend ten days out of the building for staff development, today in many parts of the country this a fairly common occurrence.

We attribute this new norm to three concurrent trends: 1) school reform, 2) increased administrator accountability , 3) the growth of principals' centers and their influence on the dialogue of what it means to be a school leader (Barth, 1986a; Hallinger & Greenblatt, 1988). The first two trends have raised the pressure exerted by educational systems on principals, as well as the expectations principals have for themselves. The third trend is reflected in the dramatic growth experienced by principals' centers, even those where participation is entirely voluntary. As more principals engage in

professional growth activities, emerging local norms about the value of professional development and collegial interaction begin to shape the behavior of local principals. Although it is likely that this form of professional socialization is most powerful in "grass roots" centers where participation is voluntary and easily accessible, some of the same normative processes are also at work in state led centers.

Mode of delivery. The array of delivery mechanisms for administrative development services parallels, to a considerable extent, the content embedded in them. On this dimension, we find wide variations in approach and principle. The delivery modes extend along a continuum that parallels the diversification of content described in the preceding section (see Figure 4).

Figure 4
Modes of Content Delivery
in Emergent Leadership Development Programs

University Professors	Programmatic Experts	Principals with Skill Expertise	Introspective Principals

---

The emergent preparation models have diversified the set of appropriate modes and people that educational administrators can learn from. University faculty are much less conspicuous in the teaching ranks for the new inservice providers than was true ten or twenty years ago. If the trend persists, in the twenty-first century future principals and developing principals will be accustomed to gaining help from an ever larger variety of sources.

Having noted the diminished role of university faculty in the inservice development of principals, it is also accurate to report that portions of the research-based program content continue to be presented by professors (and former professors) of educational administration. Much of the teacher and school effectiveness research was completed and interpreted by academicians, and active university faculty are often among the first to read new research reports. Thus, university-sponsored programs, state established academies, and even "grass roots" principals' centers frequently employ the professor of educational administration to present the initial research findings.

We have, however, also discerned a trend over the past 10 years towards the increased use of practitioners in the dissemination of research-based knowledge after programs move beyond the awareness stage. It appears that scholars adequately serve the purpose of presenting basic research findings, but practitioners need others who have experienced the practical problems of implementation if they are to go beyond knowledge and comprehension to application and synthesis (Draughon, 1986; Levine, 1986).

Also contributing to the diversity of presenters in emerging programs are managers from business and industry. Some current and future principals and headmasters have learned general management

practice from business trainers on-site in business settings. Examples of crossover programs can be found in North Carolina (Grier, 1987), Connecticut, New York, and at the Australian Administrative Staff College (Walker, 1987).

For the "skill" packages, the expert consultant remains visible in all but the most "grass roots" centers. Thus, both the National Principals' Center Network (Westchester Principals' Center, 1987) and the the National Academy for School Executives maintain consultant referral services (Hoyle, 1987). State departments of education also serve as resource brokers, identifying and disseminating or contracting with expert presenters when they get involved with administrative development (Sanders, 1987).

The closer we move toward the reflective end of the continuum presented earlier, the more we witness a growing role for principals-as-teachers. Some aspects of educational management (e.g., time management, disciplinary procedure, curriculum design) are routinely presented by colleagues to colleagues in principals' centers and academies. To this extent, principals are understood to be "experts" when it comes to leading sessions on practical skill learning, or as noted above, on the implementation of research-based knowledge.

Principals also become teaching emissaries when they serve as visiting practitioners or principals in residence at a principals' center. Visiting practitioner programs have been developed and implemented at the Harvard Principals' Center (Levine et al., 1987), the North Carolina Leadership Institute (Grier, 1987), and the Westchester (NY) Principals' Center (Hallinger et al., in press). Visiting practitioners develop and carry out highly individualized learning plans while acting as facilitators, mentors, and teachers for their colleagues during the term of their appointments.

Principals constitute the sole resource for learning when we consider the mentoring models promoted by Peer-Assisted Leadership (Barnett, 1987), collegial groups set up in the /I/D/E/A/ program (Hyland, 1986; LaPlant, 1987), collegial groups (Thoms, 1987) and the learning "syndicates" in an Australian program (Walker, 1987). In California principals are placed in discussion "triads" in the follow-up stage after completion of more formalized learning sessions (Schainker & Roberts, 1987). Whether in peer dyads or small group arrangements, principals define in the public setting of fellow principals how they understand their current role and behavior and what it is they want to change about their leadership efforts. In the process, the feedback of peers is assumed to be the most relevant and vital to every principal's learning needs.

Personalized writing by principals about their work is also characteristic of the learning modes in which principals become their own teachers. Barth (1986a) built writing into the earliest features of the Harvard Principals' Institute as did Richardson at the Georgia Principals' Institute (Richardson & Robertson, 1987). The National Network of Principals' Centers promotes learning from writing in its annual volume of Reflections which gives preference to the contribution of principals (Scott-McDonald, n.d.; Hagstrom, 1987).

Administrative Development in the Twenty-First Century

Given the variations that we observe among training programs for school administrators – even among programs in the newer "non-traditional" categories of preservice and inservice – we are prompted to look to the next developmental phase and predict which kinds of content predispositions and service delivery modes will find favor. If earlier analyses are correct (Cooper & Boyd, 1987; Murphy & Hallinger, 1987; Pohland, Milstein, Schilling, & Tonigan, 1988; Wimpelberg, in press), a paradigmatic shift has occurred, and the deductive, theory-driven, university-based approach to administrative development will continue to diminish in importance. Nevertheless, the question remains as to which variants among the newer programmatic orientations will flourish.

The Future of State Directed Approaches to Leadership Development

We believe that the most critical factor in determining the direction of administrative development in education over the next twenty years will be the persistence of the reform impulse, generally, and the longevity of the centralizing, interventionist role of state government in the work of the schools. State reform efforts based on the dichotomized view of local control versus state control prevalent in the 1980s (Timar & Kirp, 1989) would push administrative development toward the left side on each of the continua in our present analysis. State legislators and policy implementers prone to emphasize accountability and in a quest for certainty in the realm of school improvement programs will be favorably disposed toward the more predictable curricula of the effectiveness research modes and the allure of the "expert" instructor in the formalized learning setting.

Some of the assumptions behind such programs require additional analysis. First, as noted under the heading, program content, the state initiated development efforts often utilize standard curricula focusing on the dissemination of effective principal and teacher behaviors. The legitimacy of these programs is derived from the fact that the training content is based upon "research-based correlates" of school and classroom effectiveness. The research and resulting training content are treated as scientifically validated, generalizable knowledge.

While it is not our intention to minimize the contributions of these fields of research, we would note that the research base for the training content is neither scientifically validated nor generalizable. The subject of generalizability is particularly troublesome, given the contextual variation of schools and classrooms. It is assumed that principaling (and teaching) is a rational management activity that can be "engineered" into place. As Cuban has noted in his critique of California education reform, state mandates for teachers and principals to improve often assume that that "teaching [and principaling] is closer to making cars than sculptures" (Cuban, 1984, p. 2c). The existing research base in the field, though more optimistic and grounded than in the past, remains ambiguous with respect to many important issues related to effective principaling (Bridges, 1982; Rowan, Dwyer & Bossert, 1982; Murphy, Hallinger & Mitman, 1983).

We have already observed that the theory movement in educational administration has been largely replaced by a focus on effective behaviors and competencies. This "behavioral" approach to leadership development assumes that, "teachers and principals... can be trained to display the desirable traits of their counterparts in high-achieving schools. Then their pupils will excel too. School improvement, then, is an attempt to identify what schoolpeople should know and be able to do and to devise ways to get them to know how to do it. " Barth, 1986b, p. 111). While principals are heartened by the belief that they can "make a difference", we agree with Barth's (1986b) observation that:

> [M]ost teachers and principals respond to even the most enlightened lists not with renewed energy, vigor and motivation, but rather with feelings of oppression, guilt and anger. The vivid lack of congruence between the way schools are and others would have them be causes most schoolpeople to feel overwhelmed, insulted, and inadequate (p. 111).

We have witnessed this type of frustration among principals following their return to the school building after a week or two of intensive training. The knowledge that somewhere else an "effective principal" behaves in a particular manner is not necessarily helpful. Principals already concede that they do not act in ways consistent with their beliefs about school leadership. "In the allocation of their own time, educational administrators [already] do and say what is normatively demanded, notice the inconsistency between the two, and can do little about the inconsistency" (March, 1978, p. 229).

Principals may return from training sessions with new skills and perspectives, but the school structure has not changed during their absence. March (1978) noted in his analysis of public school administration that, "although improving educational administration undoubtedly involves changing it, basic features of the administrative context of schooling can neither be ignored nor routinely changed. In particular, the description above suggests a context that is ambiguous, diffuse, parochial, and normative" (p. 228). These characteristics of schooling represent obstacles to any professional development that has school improvement as its goal. We would, however, suggest that approaches which emphasize the application of "effective behaviors" are particularly handicapped by the ambiguous, diffuse, normative context of schools since they operate on a relatively low level of abstraction. Such programs seek change in principal behavior through rather simplistic means. It is possible that programs that focus less on specific behaviors and more on professional socialization and commitment may have greater effects on behavioral change. This is an empirical question open to study.

We have also noted the relative infrequency of substantive program follow-up in the forms of coaching, on-site technical assistance, or support groups in professional effectiveness programs. While these forms of technical assistance and support require substantially greater allocations of resources (i.e., time and money), sponsors who are serious about changing principal behaviors would presumably be concerned with the relative cost-effectiveness of ventures that do not include such components. Similarly, we have observed that nationally there is an almost total absence of any meaningful program evaluation among the state directed leadership academies (Murphy & Hallinger, 1986, 1987; Wimpelberg, in press). While the same could be said of the grass roots centers with respect to program evaluation, these organizations do not generally have same accountability driven mission.

These features are particularly surprising given what we know about the characteristics of "effective" staff development and change implementation in schools. It is paradoxical that programs initiated to improve system accountability by increasing the effectiveness of school administrators would ignore the same literature on organizational change and attend so marginally to the inspection of program outcomes. Though seemingly paradoxical, this phenomenon is highly consistent with the traditional functioning of schools and may be explained by analysis of school as social institutions.

As a consequence of societal competition, schools have come under increasedpressure to improve the performance of students. Yet, the ability of school administrators to dramatically improve the measurable performance of schools is limited (March, 1978; Meyer & Rowan, 1977). March (1978) observed that:

> Administrators and students of administration generally agree that what administrators do is important. The tasks assigned to them are endowed with labels that suggest the centrality of their activities - planning, coordination, control, decision making, leadership. Despite this importance, it is often difficult to describe precisely what administrators do in behavioral terms, to relate the observable behavior to the task activities specified, or to detect the impact of administrative behavior on schooling (p. 230).

Although the knowledge base in educational administration has improved somewhat since 1978, our understanding of administrative processes and their impact on educational organizations remains limited (Bridges, 1982). In the face of such technical ambiguity, educational organizations respond by appearing as the public would expect them appear if they did in fact have control over the outcomes of their actions. States allocate additional resources, impose higher standards (e.g., certification, course requirements), develop new social rituals (e.g., training academies), and draw upon

"scientifically validated knowledge" as the basis for the retraining of school leaders. These actions reinforce the social perception that what administrators do is important and demonstrates to the public that additional allocations of resources for schooling are warranted.

To the extent that administrative preparation and development need a standard, "scientifically validated" curriculum to maintain legitimacy in the public perception, the research-based effectiveness correlates and the models of effective instruction may well persist in the twenty-first century as the socially approved content. There is already some evidence that the programmatic content has spread through formal and informal networks across states along with the more general features of the state led reform agenda. The legitimation of a program in one state provides a basis for legitimation in another.

The Future of Decentralized Approaches to Leadership Development

Another scenario for the future is also possible. Earlier in the paper we noted divergent sources for the the new movement in adminstrative development: state reform efforts and the professional needs and aspirations of principals. Principals may begin to take a more active role in defining the direction of their profession. To the extent that this occurs, we see the possibility that local leadership development efforts could displace or head off the imposition of centralized development efforts.

If intermediate organizations and school districts determine the shape and scope of administrative development, we predict that the content will move toward a middle ground that emphasizes skill learning with direct applications to the task environments in which principals work. Although school district inservice often includes an awareness of research on effective teaching and effective schools, central office administrators witness the day-to-day problems about which school-based people complain. Thus, there tends to be greater concern about follow-up, though as we noted earlier there is a surprising lack of implementation support or evaluation in any of the programs.

It is most difficult to envision the future of the most individualistically oriented programs, those located on the far right side of the continua described earlier. Such programs have often have little appeal to those who monitor system performance, be they education department officials or school superintendent. Although there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that the "research-based programs" of professional training and development produce the desired results better or at all, the reform-oriented, normative expectations of policymakers will reduce the likelihood that "socially deviant" approaches to leadership development will gain widespread favor and support.

Although all forums in which principals gather together represent opportunities for professional socialization, we have observed qualitative differences between the processes at work on the different ends of the aforementioned continua. Where goals, objectives, and content are defined by others and teaching is in the hands of experts, principals may be socialized to norms of dependence and inadequacy. As e have noted, legitimacy derived by meeting socially mandated expectations (e.g., recertification) often leaves the principal feeling empty and inadequate upon return to the school. It is possible that individualized, reflective modes of professional development, though lacking social legitimacy, may produce more lasting change in attitudes and commitment to the job role. These processes emphasize the exchange of personalized constructions of knowledge and reshape the principals' normative conceptions of what it means to be a principal.

The analysis conducted in this paper describes our observations of the current scene in administrative development in education. The issues raised in the paper represent unanswered questions of significant importance to educational policy and practice. Staff development, particularly for administrators, remains an attractive domain of activity for school reformers and policy makers.

There have been substantial increases in monetary allocations to staff development for school administrators over the past ten years at the federal, state and local levels. Patricia Graham, Dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, recently called for continuing large allocations of funds for staff development, both for teachers and school leaders. Both policy makers and practitioners are in great need of research which examines the impact of different policy choices along the continua described in this paper.

References

Ackerman, R. (Ed.). (1988). National directory of principals' centers. Cambridge, MA: National Network of Principals' Centers.

Barnett, B. (1987). Peer-assisted leadership: Peer observation and feedback as catalysts for professional growth. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education (pp. 131- 149). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Barth, R. (1986a, summer). Principal centered professional development. Theory into Practice, 25(3), 156-160.

Barth, R. (1986b, December). On sheep and goats and school reform. Phi Delta Kappan,293- 296.

Bridges, E. (1982, summer). Research on the school administrator: The state of the art, 1967-1980. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18(3), 12-33.

Cooper, B. & Boyd, W. (1987). The evolution of training for school administrators. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education (pp. 3-27). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Crowson, R. & MacPherson, B. (1987). The legacy of the theory movement: Learning from the new tradition. In In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education (pp. 45- 66). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Cuban, L. (1984). The sham of school reform: Sleight of hand with numbers. San Jose Mercury, April 24, 1c, 2c,3c.

Daresh, J. (1986). Support for beginning principals: First hurdles are highest. Theory into Practice, 25, 168-173.

Draughon, B. (1986). Even champions have coaches: Principals provide professional development for their peers. Journal of Staff Development, 7(2), 81-90.

Endo, T. (1987). The Fairfax County (VA) principals' research group. NASSP Bulletin, 71(495), 48-50.

Grier, L. (1987). The North Carolina leadership institute for principals. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education (pp. 115-130). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Hagstrom, D. (Ed.) (1987). Reflections. Cambridge, MA: National Principals' Center Network.

Hallinger, P. & Greenblatt, R. (1988, April). Principals' pursuit of professional growth: The influence of personal beliefs, experiences and work context. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Hallinger, P. & Greenblatt, R. (in press). Professional development through principals' centers: Why do principals participate? NASSP Bulletin.

Hallinger, P., Greenblatt, R., & Edwards, T. (in press). The visiting practitioner role as a means of principal self-renewal. Journal of Staff Development.

Hoyle, J. (1987). The AASA model for preparing school leaders. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education (pp. 83-98). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Hyland, J. (1986). An evaluative study of the I/D/E/A principals' inservice program through an examination of professional development and school improvement efforts in the Diocese of Madison, Wisconsin. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati.

LaPlant, J. (1987). Facilitating I/D/E/A principals' collegial support groups as a means of professional development and school improvement. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education (pp. 181-200). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Levine, S. (1986). The principals' center movement: When school leaders become learners. Journal of Staff Development, 7(2), 28-41.

Levine, S., Barth, R., & Haskins, K. (1987). The Harvard Principals' Center: School leaders as adult learners. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education (pp. 150- 163). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

March, J.G. (1978, February). American public school administration: A short analysis. School Review. 217-250.

Meyer, J. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. In O. Grusky and G. Miller (Eds.) The sociology of organizations. New York: MacMillan, 530-554.

Miles, M. & Passow, H. (1957). Training in the skills needed for inservice education programs. In N.B. Henry (Ed.) In-service education for teachers, supervisors, and administrators, 56th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 1, (pp. 339-367). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Murphy, J. & Hallinger, P. (1986, Fall). Some encouraging signs in staff development for school administrators. Journal of Staff Development. 7(2), 13-27.

Murphy, J. & Hallinger, P. (Eds.). (1987). Approaches to administrative training in education. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Murphy, J. & Hallinger, P. (1987). New directions in the professional development of school administrators: A synthesis and suggestions for improvement. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education (pp. 245-282). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P., & Mitman, A. (1983). Problems with research on educational leadership: Issues to be addressed. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 5(3), 297-305.

Peterson, K. (1987). Research practice, and conceptual models: Underpinnings of a principals' institute. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education (pp. 181- 200). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Pohland, P., Milstein, M., Schilling, N., & Tonigan, J. (1988). Emergent issues in the curriculum of educational administration: The University of New Mexico case. In C. Wendel & M. Bryant (Eds.), New directions for administrator preparation. Tempe, AZ: UCEA.

Richardson, J. & Robinson, C. (1987). The Georgia principals' institute. NASSP Bulletin, 71(495), 22-23.

Rowan, B., Dwyer, D., & Bossert, S. (1982). Methodological considerations in studies of effective principals. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Sanders, S. (1987). Maryland's MPDA: The Maryland professional development academy and its odyssey in comprehensive training. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education (pp. 99-114). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Schainker, S. & Roberts, L. (1987). Helping principals overcome on-the-job obstacles to learning. Educational Leadership, 45, 30-33.

Scott-MacDonald, K. (no date). Reflections. Cambridge, MA: National Network of Principals' Centers, Harvard University.

Silver, P. (1987). The center for aadvancing principalship excellence (APEX): An approach to professionalizing educational administration. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education (pp. 67-82). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Timar, T. & Kirp, D. (1989, March). Education reform in the 1980's: Lessons from the states. Phi Delta Kappan, 504-511.

Thompson, T. (1987). Advice from four state level organizations. NASSP Bulletin, 71 (495), 10-13.

Thoms, G. (1987). The administrator's greatest professional challenge. NASSP Bulletin, 71(495), 7-9.

Walker, W.G. (1987). The Australian administrative staff college: The syndicate method. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Approaches to administrative training in education (pp. 230-244). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Westchester Principals' Center. (1987). Consultant Resource Guide. National Principals' Center Network.

Wimpelberg, R. (in press). The inservice development of principals: A new movement, its characteristics, and future. In P. Thurston & L. Lotto (Eds.), Advances in educational administration, Vol. 1. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.